

per cent is available for wearing apparel so that the production with which we are concerned is limited to 4,233,290,522 yards.

The total requirements of woolen woven goods are believed to be 604,000,000 yards and here we fall short of the mark by nearly 150,000,000 yards, our total production being 455,043,801 yards.

It does not appear plausible to attempt to work out the cost of producing a cotton dress. There is no such standard as there is in men's clothing. Where, for instance, in such wearing apparel will there be found anything that corresponds to the staple, three piece man's suit?

It is possible, however, to trace the cost of manufacturing cotton goods and to show the increases in these costs in the last nine or ten years. Printed percale is a staple with which every woman is familiar. Ten years ago it was comparatively cheap, selling for 10 cents a yard. Last year it brought 25 cents.

The total mill cost of manufacturing this percale is 12.40 cents a yard. Selling expense adds .62 cents and the mill then adds 2.98 cents for its own profit. To this must be added 2.50 cents for printing so that the wholesale price is 18.50 cents a yard. The retailer adds 6.5 cents for his profit and there you have your price of 25 cents.

In 1910 the total mill cost of producing a yard of this goods was only 4.95 cents. Since then the cost of material has increased 66.94 per cent, the cost of labor has increased 16.88 per cent and the mill expense has increased 16.18 per cent. These things have all helped to advance the price, as has the increase in the mills' profits. In 1910 the mills were content with a profit of 1.05 cents a yard but in 1919 they took 2.50 cents.

It will be remembered that when the epidemic of overall clubs broke out last spring, one of the deterrents to the success of the movement was the fact that most people found the price of overalls so high that there was more economy in making the old suit last a few weeks longer than there was in buying a suit of denims.

Before the war blue denim jumpers and pants retailed anywhere from 50 to 85 cents each. Today the 50 cent quality of 1910 retails for about \$2 and the 85 cent quality brings \$2.50.

The manufacturers' profits on a dozen of these garments has jumped from 50 cents in 1910 to \$1.62 in 1919. The retailers' profits have risen from 13 cents to 50 cents.

Finally, it may be interesting to the reader to note the manner in which clothing prices have been advancing for the last several years in the principal cities of the country. The figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are the most accurate and probably the only comprehensive statistics gathered in the country. They

have been carefully compiled over a long series of years.

The table which is presented here covers the country from New York to Seattle and from Norfolk to Detroit. It shows that from 1915 to 1917 the rise in clothing prices while heavy amounted to very little when compared to the increases which followed in the next three years.

It is shown also that New York, where hundreds of garment making factories of the United States are located, and where it might be supposed the retailers would escape freight rates, suffered the greatest advance in the price of women's wear and the third greatest advance in the price of men's clothing.

Women's wear has increased more than has men's wear in the period included in the table. The difference, however, is not so great as many have been led to believe, being a trifle less than eight per cent.

To those who are inclined to think that the battle for lower prices is won merely because the figures on the price tickets bear slightly smaller amounts than they did a few weeks ago, a study of this table will make evident the fact that it will take a great many such reductions to bring clothing prices back to anything like what may be termed a normal basis. If they drop even 50 per cent they will still be much higher than they were in 1917-1918.

The following table shows the percentage of increases in various cities:

	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920
Baltimore						
Men's wear	2.46	22.97	49.55	98.66	175.90	188.9
Women's wear	3.03	25.09	54.75	117.35	183.08	198.4
Boston						
Men's wear	6.06	20.95	45.31	112.79	172.05	189.5
Women's wear	7.76	22.85	49.92	122.54	209.13	228.9
Chicago						
Men's wear	8.51	26.53	51.91	137.06	211.78	207.7
Women's wear	6.15	21.22	50.03	141.29	232.86	202.6
Detroit						
Men's wear	1.70	19.35	46.91	123.66	203.53	235.1
Women's wear	3.00	18.30	46.46	102.54	163.16	186.1
Norfolk						
Men's wear	1.60	10.33	37.15	97.61	143.99	160.8
Women's wear		1.68	26.02	91.58	168.08	186.8
Philadelphia						
Men's wear	3.30	16.15	54.11	119.61	204.16	233.4
Women's wear	3.94	15.90	49.12	101.71	175.88	206.0
Seattle						
Men's wear79	10.87	34.81	89.88	135.00	153.1
Women's wear	1.55	11.72	37.93	86.21	162.98	183.0
New York						
Men's wear	4.78	20.32	51.40	126.39	201.26	220.8
Women's wear	4.87	24.73	57.63	137.15	234.97	258.8

Average increase of men's wear, 198.66; average increase of women's wear, 206.32; 1920 figures are complete to June 30.

Millerand: France's Arch-Militarist

Concluded from page 3

of the distressed populations through the winters of 1918 and 1919 with the idea of emphasizing the heinousness of the German delay in furnishing the money for reparations.

He has always professed a special admiration and friendship for America and the Americans, although nothing could be more obvious than his lack of any real sympathy with the democratic idealism of President Wilson, or his readiness to turn American friendship and aid to his own purposes and the militaristic aggrandizement and glory of France, which I am convinced he honestly believes to be the greatest nation on earth and destined to display this supremacy by dictation to and domination of all the remaining nations of the earth.

In October, 1918, he introduced in glowing terms an American, Professor C. Bertrand Thompson, then consulting engineer of the French Ministry of Munitions and formerly a Harvard lecturer, on the occasion of the first of a course of lectures given by Professor Thompson on the Taylor system of scientific management before the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers. Among other pretty things the present Premier then said, I quote the following:

"Interesting and important as is the subject of the lectures to be given here by Mr. Thompson, he will permit me to say that before aught else at this hour that which gives it importance for a French audience is the nationality of the lecturer. We seize the occasion which is offered to us to manifest once again to his noble country the ardent gratitude of our own. 'La Fayette, nous voilà!'" (Pershing's famous declaration at the tomb of La Fayette, 'La Fayette, we are here!') "This exclamation, so eloquent in its simplicity, recounts the history of more than a century and tells how magnificently President Wilson and his compatriots have repaid the debt of their ancestors. To America, France, with all humanity, will be indebted for her liberation and for the new era which opens before her. The understanding between the two peoples born during the first War of Independence and rendered indissoluble in the second, is destined to remain not less close or less fruitful in the works of peace than in the battles of the war. Once our arms are laid down, a single problem will absorb all our energies: the problem of production. Professor Bertrand Thompson brings to us some elements of its solution."

Just now it would seem to be the problem of destruction that M. Millerand desires should absorb the energies of France and of America and Britain. No premier in the history of the third republic has shown himself so hostile to organized labor and all its aspirations. Next to collecting the coin claimed by French bondholders from wasted and impoverished Russia, by the sacrifice of France's already depleted manhood, Millerand's present action in direct contravention of the Hythe agreements with Britain and Italy in extending active support to General Wrangel's war on the Soviet Republic is designed to deprive the workers of France of political power in order to sustain and perpetuate the reactionary bloc brought into parliamentary control by a gerrymandered and cooked "proportional representation" election law. We had ocular

evidence of this in Paris when early on the morning of May Day some twenty thousand troops with cavalry, artillery and machine gun units, were marched into the city and stationed at several strategic points to enforce the prohibition of labor parades or other demonstrations, although the General Confederation of Labor had issued strict injunctions to all its members to observe the strictest order. And conflicts provoked by this show of force resulted in the killing and wounding of a number of citizens.

A little later Millerand startled even the most conservative people by the *coup* calling for the legal dissolution of the General Confederation of Labor, on the ground that it had violated the law of 1884 under which it was incorporated by declaring in favor of the nationalization of the coal mines. Now the General Confederation of Labor corresponds in France in a general way to the American Federation of Labor in the United States. It sustained the government strongly in waging the war and, although it has a "left" or radical wing, the Conservatives are in control. Its president, M. Jouhaix, was France's official representative at the first meeting of the International Labor Conference of the League of Nations that met a few months ago in Washington. When the case came up for hearing and M. Jouhaix was called, he asked for an adjournment of the hearing that he might fulfill his official duty, to which he was appointed by M. Clemenceau by attending the meeting of the same body charged with consideration of the working conditions of seamen at Genoa!

It was shown that the constitution of the Confederation had practically from the start favored the socialization of certain industries, especially those of a monopolistic nature, and that therefore there was no reason for invoking this 36-year-old law to put the organization out of existence. Millerand doubtless hoped by this move to counteract the encouragement to boldness in the demands of the more radical wing of the Confederation, and of the Socialists generally, found in the military successes of the Russian Bolsheviks, in the military successes had gone on record as despatching French support of the Czarist generals and of Polish aggression, and demanded the opening up of diplomatic and trade relations with the *de facto* government of Russia. Millerand's *coup* served an immediate object of much importance to those concerned in weakening the political strength of the Labor party by preventing the affiliation with the General Confederation of Labor of the government employees and functionaries, whose conditions as to both hours and wages called painfully for the amelioration that "unionization" promised. This was practically admitted by the Millerand ministry in the bill, which it then promptly brought in and rushed through the chambers, recognizing the right of these employees to organize and to bargain collectively in an organization of their own under government auspices and supervision, and granting substantial improvements in the matter of compensation, accident and health insurance, pensions, and so on.

Striking comparisons between the Millerand of 20 years ago and the Millerand of today in the matter

of his attitude toward labor organization, appeared recently in certain liberal journals, citing from M. Lavy's history of the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet in which Millerand, as has been said, was Minister of Commerce. In a speech made in June, 1900, announcing himself in favor of consulting the trades unions regarding economic laws, he declared: "The workers are already aware that, to share through delegates from their ranks in the elaboration of economic reforms which concern them most, it should be sufficient that they enroll themselves in the great army, of which the trades unions are the battalions." And it is asked why the premier should now reproach the workers for complying with the conditions he then deemed necessary and sufficient for their participation in such economic reforms touching their lives as the nationalization of the mines and the railways.

On another occasion, Millerand, brought by an interpellation concerning the strike to speak on the dominant importance in his eyes of the development of the organization of trades unions, said: "This has been the leading idea of my administration since I have had the honor of being at the Ministry of Commerce. I have always believed it indispensable to do all I could to facilitate the legal organization of unions and of labor exchanges (Bourses du travail)." With a zeal rare among cabinet ministers, M. Lavy, his close collaborator in the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry, points out, M. Millerand, not content with recognizing in his speeches these trades union organizations, also took an active part in that movement, so that it was due largely to his initiative and impulsion that it experienced the rapid and substantial growth evidenced in the fact that between January 1, 1899, and January 1, 1901, it had grown from 2,361 unions aggregating 419,761 members to 3,287 unions with a total membership of 588,832. The whirligig of time certainly brings its revenges when it presents a prime minister in the rôle of destroyer of the work of his own hands!

Despite much criticism of his financial policy, of his concessions to the British in the matter of the Mosul oil fields and as to exacting forfeitures of territory from Germany for her failure to deliver coal and to pay the indemnity, M. Millerand has been able over and over again to obtain votes of confidence from a chamber elected on the issues of the Bolshevik bogie, the strict execution of the Treaty of Versailles and the consolidation of the monarchist, clerical and bourgeois coalition against the radical and labor elements in France's population.

Probably the chamber will sustain him in his present rash militaristic ventures. He has, despite the "explanations" to Great Britain and Italy and his note to America, evidently taken the plunge which definitely splits France from her former allies, if we are to trust press dispatches announcing the dispatch to Wrangel of huge quantities of military supplies, the taking over of the Polish command by French generals, the concentration of large numbers of additional French troops in occupied Germany and the actual violation of German neutrality by the transportation of troop trains across Germany in the direction of the Polish and Russian frontiers.